

THE DAILY JOURNAL

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1896.
Washington Office—1410 Pennsylvania Avenue
Telephone Calls.
Business office—238. Editorial office—186.
TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.
DAILY BY MAIL.
Daily only, one month, \$1.00
Daily only, three months, \$2.50
Daily only, one year, \$9.00
Daily, including Sunday, one year, \$10.00
Sunday only, one year, \$5.00
WHEN FURNISHED BY AGENTS.
Daily, per week, by carrier, 15 cts
Sunday, single copy, 5 cts
Daily and Sunday, per week, by carrier, 30 cts
WEEKLY.
Per year, \$10.00
Reduced Rates to Clubs.
Subscribe with any of our numerous agents or send subscriptions to the
JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,
Indianapolis, Ind.
Persons sending the Journal through the mails in the United States should put on an eight-page paper a ONE-CENT postage stamp, a two-cent postage stamp on a sixteen-page paper a TWO-CENT postage stamp. Foreign postage is usually double these rates.
All communications intended for publication in this paper must, in order to receive attention, be accompanied by the name and address of the writer.
THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL.
Can be found at the following places:
NEW YORK—Windsor Hotel and Astor House.
CHICAGO—Palmer House and P. O. News Co.
CINCINNATI—J. R. Hawley & Co., 154 Vine
LOUISVILLE—C. T. Deering, northwest corner of Third and Jefferson streets, and Louisville Book Co., 34 Fourth avenue.
ST. LOUIS—Union News Company, Union Depot.
WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Hotel, 2000
Hotel, 1410 Pennsylvania Avenue, and the Washington News Exchange, Fourteenth street, between Penn. Avenue and F Street.
Protection against European paper should include protection against European papers.
The cost of the election in Marion county, under the Republican regime, was more than \$5,000 less than it was in 1894.
One of the first duties of the new Congress will be to devise some practical and effective plan of restricting foreign immigration.
Despite the fact that tens of thousands have found employment since the election the devotees of the money mine trust are very unhappy.
The people of this country prefer paper money for practical purposes, but they have come to the conclusion that they want gold dollars close behind the paper.
One would think that the Populists would have been appealing to class prejudice, but some of them have not learned any better from the event of Tuesday, Nov. 3.
Mr. McKinley's frank recognition of the great and patriotic service rendered by the grand old men of the party in the recent election augurs well for the liberality of his administration.
The late election has made Uncle Sam the most influential person in the world's family of nations. Had it gone otherwise than it did he would have had a back seat in the company.
The Farmers' Congress could safely pledge the payment of \$1,000,000 to any man who can discover a sure preventive of hog cholera. This fact it seems to have baffled both skill and experience.
Mr. Bryan's "drones" seem to be doing their share toward expediting prosperity by starting new enterprises. By the way, if free silver had succeeded what could his followers have done in that direction?
In this State the Populists have got the best of the Populists in the county fairs because they have obtained a larger proportion of the offices that were their due. In some counties, with 300 or 400 votes, the Populists got one-third of the county offices.
A few months ago one of the large cities of New York found it impossible to place its bonds on fair terms. Since last week New York city was offered ten times the \$10,000,000 of bonds it called for, at a premium which reduced its rate of 3% to about 2 per cent.
The Journal is not quite certain as to what the initiative and referendum in law-making means, but the Farmers' National Congress declared against it and also against the income tax. The congress will get itself disliked should it not stay its destroying hand.
The States of Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin, of the central West, save McKinley \$2,000,000 of the plurality of about a million votes. All of these States were claimed by Chairman Jones for Bryan two weeks before the election.
Among the minor good results of the recent election was that Tammany, for the first time in its history, met defeat in a presidential year. If the Republicans can follow this up by carrying Greater New York next fall it will tend still further to break up the power of the machine.
An attempt will be made in the Lexington (Ky.) district to have the election of Stoll, Republican, for the Legislature, set aside on the ground that he is a State officer, being commissioner of a State asylum. Should he be declared ineligible, the Republicans will not have a majority in the Legislature. One of these days parties will learn to require the candidate for an office to resign the one he holds.
Notwithstanding the testimony of some inspectors to the contrary the Journal insists that the voting accommodations at the recent election, so far as this is concerned, were crude and inconvenient. The booths, particularly, were too small and the facilities inside for stamping and folding the large ballots were very inadequate. As the State has taken charge of elections and prescribed a particular method of voting it should furnish proper conveniences.
The New York Journal, owned by a silver-mine millionaire, says that "bimetallism is sure to win." Sure to win? Why, bimetallism did win in the election. We shall continue to have gold and silver for money in larger quantities than ever before—read bimetallism, because the silver dollar is so tied to the gold that it is just as good. If Bryan had won we should have had silver monometallism. That is what the New York Journal desires, and it should no longer imagine that it can fool the people by calling it bimetallism.
Kansas, under a new regime of Populism, promises worse things than were experienced during the two years after the election of 1892. The Supreme Court will hereafter be controlled by the Populists, with a Chief Justice who has been declaring for years that "the rights of the user are paramount to the rights of the owner." With such a man in the court of last resort, capital will hurry out of Kansas as fast as it can go. Already a Populist circuit judge has appointed a receiver for four or five hundred miles of the Santa Fe railroad under a law which was not intended to apply to railroads, but to prevent alien landholdings. Probably the officers of the ill-fated Santa Fe will not be deprived of a property which has given the people of Kansas railroad facilities at the expense of the Eastern stockholders, but the action of the Populist judge shows the disposition of the wreckers of property in that State.
MISLEADING STATEMENTS.
There are some points in the address of Judge Lawrence before the Farmers' Congress which can be fully indorsed, while others may be fairly criticized. The topics which he specified for the action of Congress and those to which he calls attention for State legislation will meet with general approval. State taxation has increased the past decade in several States, and local taxation has increased practically all over the country. Better schools, and, in many sections, better streets and highways will account for a part of the increase. For the improvement of cities and the construction of better roads money intelligently expended is well expended. One point which Judge Lawrence makes is worthy of notice; it is that in most States there are organizations of county officers whose representatives are active about legislatures while the former is at home. Public institutions are always well represented about legislatures. A long list of salaries is presented in every Legislature in the country, asking increases, and there are always advocates for the creation of new places. If the farmers, manufacturers and others interested in moderate taxation could have a few men about legislative bodies in their pay to oppose such schemes it would be very effective.
The points in the address to which objection can be made are those which affect the profits of farming. In his estimate the farmer sells nothing but corn, wheat and hay. Cattle, hogs, sheep, wool, dairy products, etc., find no place in his list. Even the prices of the articles he names, as given by Mr. Lawrence, are below the average of any five years in the last twenty. The price of corn may not be over a cent a bushel, as he puts it, in some portions of the country, but December corn is quoted at 75 cents in Chicago. Moreover, the price of corn averaged 42.5 cents a bushel during the five years beginning with 1890, against 38.5 cents during the five years beginning with 1875. Wheat must be worth more than 90 cents a bushel in any part of the country now, when it is quoted from 75 cents to 80 cents in Chicago. Nor is that a fair illustration which makes eleven bushels of corn the cost of a day's board in a hotel. No considerable portion of the farmers or other people engaged in the industries board in hotels, but when the prices of the necessities of life other than those of agriculture are compared with the same, years ago, a much greater decline is shown. This is especially true of clothing and house furnishing goods.
The one factor which controls prices seems to have been forgotten by Judge Lawrence—supply and demand. Abundant crops and low prices go together. The world's wheat crop has been rather above the world's demand or ability to purchase in recent years. Now comes the India famine, taking from the world's market less than 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, but as the result the price goes from 55 cents to 75 cents within the interval of a few weeks. It may be added that one of the causes of the low price of wheat is the falling off in the per capita consumption in this country since 1892, incident to the closing of factories and the general loss of employment. Restore full employment with good wages, and one of the causes of low prices will be removed unless the world's average of wheat is largely increased.
The natural remedy for the low prices of wheat and corn is to turn portions of the farms to other products. In Nebraska the production of beets for the manufacture of sugar has proved profitable. If it is more profitable to produce sugar than wheat in France and Germany, why should it not be made remunerative here? There must be some remedy for the low prices incident to abundant production; but presenting the condition of agriculture in the most unfavorable light will take from farmers the hopefulness essential to success under favorable circumstances.
CABINET GOSSIP.
Cabinet gossip is a harmless pastime, and whether harmless or not, is probably unpreventable. A Cabinet position is not as high relatively as it was in the earlier history of the government, and some recent Cabinets of mediocre men have had a distinct tendency to lower it. Yet the people still connect with the position something of the dignity and importance that attached to it when Cabinet officers were called "the President's constitutional advisers," though the Constitution makes no mention of them whatever.
Among the names brought out by the present gossip are those of Mark Hanna and Cornelius N. Bliss. Both are successful business men of high standing. It goes without saying that Mr. Hanna could have any position he might desire from the next President, but he is reported as saying that he does not desire any position whatever, and perhaps that is so. Politics is a side issue with him, and while he has achieved distinction by his first essay in the business, it does not follow that he would care to make a career of it, especially if it involved the abandonment or neglect of large and lucrative business enterprises. He has shown that he has capacity to manage great undertakings, and with his executive ability and business training would probably make a good Secretary of the Treasury.
Mr. Bliss was the treasurer of the Republican national committee, and stands very close to Mr. McKinley and to Mr. Hanna. He has been extensively interested in the wholesale dry goods business and is also largely interested in banking and insurance companies, and is altogether a successful business man with considerable financial experience.
It is a little singular that both of these names have been met with the suggestion that they are ineligible under Section 213 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which reads, in part, as follows:
No person appointed to the office of Secretary of the Treasury, or to the office of any other officer of the United States, shall, directly or indirectly, be concerned or interested in carrying on the business of trade or commerce, or in any other business, in part of any sea vessel or purchase by public or another in trust for him any public bonds or other public securities, or be concerned in the purchase or disposal of any public securities of any State or of the United States.
This law was passed in 1789, and that part of it which relates to trade and commerce evidently meant foreign trade. The same

prohibition was extended to some subordinate officers of the treasury who have official relations with commerce and navigation, but most of the officers of the department are exempt from it. It has very little foundation in reason and might as well be repealed. If it is to be construed as applying to all kinds of trade or commerce it is effect to prevent any successful business man from being appointed Secretary of the Treasury and confine the President's choice to professional politicians or persons not engaged in business. This would shut out the very class of men from whom it is sometimes desirable that the Secretary of the Treasury should be selected. Of course, a business man who falls under the prohibition can make himself eligible by severing his connection with all business enterprises, but no person should be asked to make such a sacrifice in order to qualify himself to serve the government. If the law above quoted applies to Messrs. Hanna and Bliss it would apply to every successful business man in the country and be an embarrassing restriction on the President in making this important appointment.
The votes of the Southern cities in the late election are significant of the changing sentiment of the people who are in contact with the business world. In 1892 General Harrison received but 290 votes in Richmond, Va., to Mr. Cleveland's 10,235. This year the vote stood: McKinley, 5,082; Bryan, 7,738; Palmer, 247. Fulton county, Georgia, embraces the progressive city of Atlanta. In 1892 Harrison's vote was 1,264 and Mr. Cleveland's 4,693. This year McKinley received 3,006 to 4,500 for Bryan. This result was obtained with all the influential daily papers supporting Bryan. In Charleston, S. C., four years ago, the Republican vote was 430 and the Democratic 1,564. This year McKinley had 1,110 votes; Palmer, 536, and Bryan, 1,488—a majority of 236 over McKinley. Louisville, Ky., gave McKinley 23,907 to 14,344 for Harrison in 1892, while Bryan received 16,541 to 20,519 for Cleveland. Hamilton county, Tennessee, in which is the city of Chattanooga, gave McKinley 4,460 and Bryan 3,268. In Memphis McKinley's vote was 253 less than Bryan's, but in 1892 Harrison's vote was 1,110 and Cleveland's 6,357. In Davidson county, which embraces the city of Nashville, McKinley received 6,500 votes and Bryan 7,840; but in 1892 Harrison received only 2,903 to Cleveland's 8,190. These are very striking changes, showing that the people in the principal cities are no longer controlled by the appeals of those who would keep up a selfish South.
If ex-President Harrison wants to go back to the Senate there is Vorhees's place to be filled by a Republican Legislature. And his friends are quietly pushing his claims against those of C. W. Fairbank, the temporary chairman of the St. Louis convention.
This from the Springfield Republican, one of those truly good papers which assume a holler-than-thou attitude toward other papers that neglect to accompany every assertion of fact with an affidavit. Nevertheless, the mere appearance in its columns of information does not insure its truth. The foregoing statement is absolutely without foundation. Mr. Harrison's friends are not pushing his claims for the senatorship, and have no intention of doing so. When he declined to be a candidate for renomination to the presidency his friends accepted in the good faith with which it was given his statement that he preferred to remain a private citizen.
There is one thing the farmer who is inclined to be pessimistic does not take into consideration, and that is the part of his living which comes from the farm and of which he makes no account whatever. If he should keep an account of all the articles which wage earners and others in cities must pay cash for and add the total to the income of his farm, his earnings would have very different totals. From these totals he would find that he would upon the farmer as the class which has the hardest time of it. While they are not rich, and do not accumulate fortunes, the farmers in Indiana who have small farms paid for are really the most independent body of people in the State. When factories shut down or lack of business causes the discharge of labor, the farmer has shelter and something upon which his family can comfortably subsist.
The Boston Journal has a cartoon which represents Uncle Sam presenting our war ship Texas to John Bull. This is because the design was purchased by England by Secretary Whitney. It was the first ship built by the Cleveland administration, and being represented that there were no naval architects in this country, Mr. Whitney paid \$75,000 for the plans. It is the only one of our war ships which is not American. Counting repairs the Texas has cost as much as the first-class battle ship Indiana, though only two-thirds as large. No better war vessels of the class are built in the world than the latest launched ships of our navy.
Up to March 10 of this year Spain had sent 121,235 troops to Cuba. This is the largest military force ever transported by sea by any government. The Spanish armada did not equal it, nor any naval expedition of Great Britain. Before these troops were sent to Cuba there were 20,000 Spanish troops there, so that, barring losses by death or battle, General Weyler has now an army of nearly 140,000 men with which to conquer a force of less than 40,000. He seems to be getting ready for a supreme effort, the success or failure of which will probably decide the war.
The local organ of the late Bryan and free-silver movement continues to talk about "the money power" and "plutocrats." Perhaps it is too much to expect that the advocates of class hatred should get rid of their vicious ideas immediately. The result of the recent election should be no more than that the people want a rest from their exploitation. Equally contemptible are the efforts of the local organ to belittle the signs of reviving confidence and industry. Recurring again to the recent election it should learn that the people are not fools.
BUBBLES IN THE AIR.
Mere Vague Assumption.
"She is a daughter of the revolution?"
"Sister, I believe."
Empty.
"Hungry Higgins?" said the kind lady.
"Of course that is not your real name?"
"None," answered Mr. Higgins. "It's not might be called an empty title."
The Feminine Instinct.
"I admit that as yet woman is not absolutely out of her sphere," said the high-browed lady.
"I thought as much," said the base man.
"If she felt that it was really and truly

THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1896.

her own she would have already had it decorated with pink ribbons."
"Didn't need it."
"Could I sell you one of these nice puff scarfs?" asked the gentlemanly clerk.
"String tie is good enough for me," answered Mr. Jason. "I never wear a shirt more'n three days, anyhow."
HOWELLS ON RILEY.
The Novelist Pleasantly Reviews the Poet's "Child-World."
The Tatler.
It is a very pleasant thing to have again a long poem, such as people used to write in the earlier and simpler ages of this planet. I have been hoping, if not quite looking, for something of the kind of late, and I cannot just now think of any poet living whom I would rather have had fulfill my prophetic longing (I will confess) than Mr. Howells. The subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to own me brother when I accuse him of rhyming months and once, or often breaking a line upon an adjective, and even dividing a couplet upon a definite article. But the subject is not new. James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps it is not well for me in my quality of critic to explain that I lost my heart to Mr. Riley a good while ago, but I suppose I am not very Rhadamanthine (if I may be allowed so much), and I am sure that to judge a poet by one's affection is not the best way of doing him justice. It is certain that one cannot judge him fairly if one does not like him. My love for Mr. Riley's work, I believe, does not hide from me some differences to be noticed in his poetry. I am not a technical poet myself, and I think the faithful little word-picker of them all ought to